

Application No. 09/762,387
Amendment dated November 10, 2005
Reply to Office Action of October 28, 2005

Docket No.: 21900-00020-US
Page 14 of 16

REMARKS

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Claims 3-5 and 13-27 are allowed.

Claims 6 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Eto et al. (USP 5,701,581).

To expedite the prosecution, claim 6 has been amended to further clarify the claimed invention by positively reciting compressing means which is not only for compressing image data but also for compressing image data of I frame in response to the I frame sending request.

As discussed by applicant in the Remarks section of the previous responses, Eto et al. does not disclose insertion of "I" frames nor the structure where insertion of "I" frames is performed by the control from the decoder side or the CCU side. In the previous amendment claim 6 stated that when a receiving device which is receiving compressed image data from a first transmitting device, is switched to receive another compressed image data from another or second transmitting device, the receiving device sends an I frame sending request to the second transmitting device. As a result, the second transmitting device sends a compressed image data of I frame in response to the I frame sending request to the receiving device.

The present amendment to claim 6 additionally recites that "said compressing means being responsive to said I frame sending request to compress said image data of I frame thereby sending out compressed image data of I frame to said network".

427499

Application No. 09/762,387
Amendment dated November 10, 2005
Reply to Office Action of October 28, 2005

Docket No.: 21900-00020-US
Page 15 of 16

As is known in the art of image data compression, I frame refers to intra frame. More specifically, I frame is one of three kinds of frames or pictures, i.e. I frame (I picture), B frame (B picture), and P frame (P picture) which constitute compressed image data resulting from predictive coding. Since Eto et al. does not refer to such intra frame resulting from image data compression, Eto cannot possibly anticipate these claims.

Eto al. does not disclose the structure or operation that the compressing means is responsive to the I frame sending instruction for generating compressed image data of I frame so as to send out the same.

In summary, applicant believes that the claims are not rejectable under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) based on anticipation by the cited prior art.

Anticipation requires the disclosure, in a prior art reference, of each and every limitation as set forth in the claims. *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc.*, 1 USPQ2d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *Akzo N.V. v. U.S. International Trade Commissioner*, 1 USPQ2d 1241 (Fed. Cir. 1986). There must be no difference between the claimed invention and reference disclosure for an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102. *Scripps Clinic and Research Foundation v. Genetech, Inc.*, 18 USPQ2d 1001 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *Studiengesellschaft Kohle GmbH v. Dart Industries*, 220 USPQ 841 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Application No. 09/762,387
Amendment dated November 10, 2005
Reply to Office Action of October 28, 2005

Docket No.: 21900-00020-US
Page 16 of 16

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 22-0185, under Order No. 21900-00020-US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: November 10, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Morris Liss

Registration No.: 24,510
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1990 M Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036-3425
(202) 331-7111
(202) 293-6229 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant